



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/314,644	05/19/1999	PAUL WESCHLER		5490

32658 7590 02/27/2004
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEEN ST.
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/314,644

Applicant(s)

WESCHLER, PAUL

Examin r

Charles E Anya

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-8,10-12,14-22,24-28,31-37 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-8,10-12,14-22,24-28,31-37 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1,2,5-8,10-12,14-22,24-28,31-37 and 39 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1,2,5-8,10-12,14-22,24-28,31-36 and 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,633,923 B1 to Kukura et al. in view of U.K. Pat. No. 2,347,766 A to Wilson.**

4. As to claim 1, Kukura teaches a method for providing a reference to a first service to a second service in a computer system comprising: enabling definition of a service connector interface in conjunction with said first service ("...binding..." Col. 5 Ln. 28 – 47, Col. 43 Ln. 23 – 35), subsequently invoking said service connector interface in conjunction with said second service, wherein said subsequently invoking includes instantiating said service connector interface at said second service ("...binding..." Col. 5 Ln. 33 – 47, Col. 49 Ln. 67), and gaining reference to said first service by said second service comprising the steps of retrieving a service instance at said service connector interface, obtaining a service reference from said first service and return, said service

Art Unit: 2126

reference obtained from said first service to said second service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 33 – 47, IOR Col. 42 Ln. 22 – 31, Col. 43 Ln. 1 – 9, Col. 50 Ln. 14 – 18) wherein said steps of subsequently invoking said service connector interface and gaining reference to said first service are carried out by an application program operative conjunction with said second service and wherein the service connector has no prior information regarding the first service prior to the gaining reference step (“...IOR...” Col. 43 Ln. 49 – 51).

Kukura is silent with reference to the instantiating that includes reading a configuration file providing an indicator for said service connector interface.

Wilson teaches the instantiating that includes reading a configuration file providing an indicator for said service connector interface (“...alx file...” page 3 lines 4 – 29). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Wilson to the system of Kukura. One would have been motivated to make such a modification to ascertain the location and versions of software in local or remote systems (page 3 lines 39 – 43).

5. As to claim 2, Kukura teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said step of enabling definition of said service connector interface comprises the step of: developing a computer program module adhering to said service connector interface in conjunction with said first service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 28 – 47, Col. 43 Ln. 23 – 35).

6. As to claim 5, Kukura as modified is silent with reference to the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of specifying a particular version of said first service that said second service desires to invoke.

Wilson teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of specifying a particular version of said first ("...alx file..." page 3 lines 4 – 29, Also see Abstract). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Wilson to the system of Kukura. One would have been motivated to make such a modification to ascertain the location and versions of software in local or remote systems (page 3 lines 39 – 43).

7. As to claims 6-8,14-17,32-35 see the rejection of claim 5.

8. As to claim 10, Kukura teaches a computer program product comprising: a computer usable medium having computer readable code embodied therein for providing a reference to a first service in a distributed environment to a second service in a local environment in a computer system comprising: computer readable program code devices configured to cause said computer system to effect enabling definition of a service connector interface in conjunction with said first service ("...binding..." Col. 5 Ln. 28 – 47, Col. 43 Ln. 23 – 35), the service connector interface encapsulating logic necessary to retrieve service instances in the distributed environment not in a directory service in the local environment ("...unknown..." Col. 43 Ln. 49 – 51), computer readable program code devices configured to cause said computer system to said effect subsequently invoking said service connector interface in conjunction with said second

service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 33 – 47, Col. 49 Ln. 67), computer readable program code devices configured to cause said computer system to effect gaining reference to said first service by said second service, wherein said computer readable program code devices comprise: computer readable program code devices configured to computer system to effect retrieving a service instance at said service connector interface/ computer readable program code devices configured to cause said computer system to effect obtaining service reference from said first service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 33 – 47, IOR Col. 42 Ln. 22 – 31, Col. 43 Ln. 1 – 9, Col. 50 Ln. 14 – 18) and a computer readable program code devices configured to cause said computer system to effect returning, said service reference obtained from said first service to said second service. (Col. 50 Ln. 13 – 18). Also see the rejection of claim 1.

9. As to claim 11, Kukura teaches the computer program product of claim 10 wherein said computer readable program code devices configured to cause said computer system to effect enabling definition of said service connector interface comprises: computer readable program code devices configured to cause said computer system to effect allowing for developing a computer program module adhering to said service connector interface in conjunction with said first service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 28 – 47, Col. 43 Ln. 23 – 35).

10. As to claim 12, Kukura teaches the computer program product of claim 10 wherein said computer readable program code devices configured to cause said

computer system to effect subsequently invoking said service connector interface comprises: computer readable program code devices configured to cause said computer system to effect instantiating said service connector at said second service (“...object adapters...” Col. 49 Ln. 35 – 67).

11. As to claim 18, Kukura teaches the computer program product of claim 10, wherein said computer readable program code devices configured to cause said computer system to effect subsequently invoking said service connector interface and said computer readable program code devices configured to cause said computer system to effect gaining reference to said first service are carried out by an application program operative in conjunction with said second service (“...IOR...” Col. 43 Ln. 49 – 51).

12. As to claim 19, Kukura teaches a method for providing a reference to a first service to a second service in a computer system comprising: providing for enabling definition of a service connector interface in conjunction with said first service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 28 – 47, Col. 43 Ln. 23 – 35), providing for subsequently invoking said service connector interface in conjunction with said second service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 33 – 47, Col. 49 Ln. 67), and providing for gaining reference to said first service by said second service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 33 – 47, IOR Col. 42 Ln. 22 – 31, Col. 43 Ln. 1 – 9, Col. 50 Ln. 14 – 18).

Kukura is silent with reference to providing for specifying a particular version of said first service that said second service desires to invoke.

Wilson teaches providing for specifying a particular version of said first service that said second service desires to invoke (“...aix file...” page 3 lines 4 – 29). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Wilson to the system of Kukura. One would have been motivated to make such a modification to ascertain the location and versions of software in local or remote systems (page 3 lines 39 – 43).

13. As to claim 20, Kukura teaches the method of claim 19 wherein said step of enabling definition of said service connector interface comprises the step of: providing for developing a computer program module adhering to said service connector interface in conjunction with said first service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 28 – 47, Col. 43 Ln. 23 – 35).

14. As to claim 21, Kukura teaches the method of claim 19 wherein said step of providing for subsequently invoking said service connector interface comprises the step of providing for instantiating said service connector at said second service (“...object adapters...” Col. 49 Ln. 35 – 67).

15. As to Claim 22, Kukura teaches the method of claim 19 wherein said step of providing for gaining reference to said first service by said second service comprises the steps of: providing for retrieving a service instance at said service connector

interface/providing for obtaining a service reference from said first service/providing for returning said service reference obtained from said first service to said second service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 33 – 47, IOR Col. 42 Ln. 22 – 31, Col. 43 Ln. 1 – 9, Col. 50 Ln. 14 - 18).

16. As to claim 24-26, see the rejection of claim 19.

17. As to claim 27, Kukura teaches the method of claim 19 wherein said steps of providing for invoking said service connector interface and providing for gaining reference to said first service are carried out by application program operative in conjunction with said second service (“...IOR...” Col. 43 Ln. 49 – 51).

18. As to claim 28, Kukura teaches a system for providing dynamic references between services in a computer system comprising: means for enabling definition of a service connector interface in conjunction with said first service, said definition enabling means includes means for developing a program module adhering to said service connector interface in conjunction With said first service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 28 – 47, Col. 43 Ln. 23 – 35), means for subsequently invoking said service connector interface in conjunction with said second service, wherein said means for subsequently invoking said service connector interface comprises means for instantiating said service connector at said second service and means for gaining reference to said first service

by said second service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 33 – 47, IOR Col. 42 Ln. 22 – 31, Col. 43 Ln. 1 – 9, Col. 50 Ln. 14 - 18). Also see the rejection of claim 1.

19. As to claim 31, Kukura teaches the system of claim 28 wherein said means for gaining reference to said first service by said second service comprises: means for retrieving a service instance at said service connector interface; means for obtaining a service reference from said first service; and means for returning said service reference obtained from said first service to said second service (“...IOR...” Col. 50 Ln. 13 – 18).

20. As to claim 36, Kukura teaches the system of claim 28 wherein said means for subsequently invoking said service connector interface and means for gaining reference to said first service are carried out by an application program operative in conjunction with said second service (“...IOR...” Col. 43 Ln. 49 – 51).

21. As to claim 39, Kukura teaches a computer-implemented method for providing an application with access to a service without the use of a directory service, comprising: instantiating with the application a service connector for the service based on the requesting with the application that the service connector provide access to the service (“...binding...” Col. 5 Ln. 32 – 47), wherein the requesting includes an identification of a version of the service for which the application is requesting access; first operating the service connector to lookup an instance of the service (Col. 50 Ln. 13 – 18), second operating the service connector to obtain a reference to the instance of the service/third

operating the service connector to return the reference to the instance of the service to the application/operating the application to request identification of an interface implemented by the referenced service and operating the service connector to retrieve and return the identification to the application for use in utilizing the referenced service (“...IOR....” Col. 42 Ln. 23 – 39, Col. 43 Ln. 1 – 25, Col. 50 Ln. 13 – 18).

Kukura is silent with reference to reading a configuration file with the application to determine an indicator to the service.

Wilson teaches reading a configuration file with the application to determine an indicator to the service (“...alx file...” page 3 lines 4 – 29). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Wilson to the system of Kukura. One would have been motivated to make such a modification to ascertain the location and versions of software in local or remote systems (page 3 lines 39 – 43).

22. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,633,923 B1 to Kukura et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,006,279 to Hayes.

23. As to claim 37, Kukura teaches a core profile engine for use in gateway or firewall servers for enabling client applications to access plug-in service modules in a distributed computing environment without embedding location and negotiation logic within the client applications (“...runtime dynamic...” Col. 43 Ln. 1 – 51), the engine comprising: an application programming interface in communication with the client applications and adapted with interfaces for processing a request for a service provided

by one of the plugin service modules (“...object adapter...” Col. 49 Ln. 35 – 67), and a pluggable interface attaching to the plug-in service modules, wherein the attaching includes providing an initialization parameter comprising a storage location for each of the Plug-in service modules, wherein the pluggable interface further includes a service connector associated with each of the attached plug-in service modules that is adapted to receive the service request from the application programming interface and to return a reference to the one service module providing the service based on the storage location (“ART...” Col. 31 Ln. 60 – 67).

Kukura is silent with reference to the plug-in service modules being selected from a group consisting an authorization plug-in, an authentication plug-in, a notification plug-in, a log plug-in, group plug-in, an entity identification factory plug-in, and a replication plug-in.

Hayes does not teach all the listed plug-ins however he does teach group plug-in (Col. 5 Ln. 13 – 24). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Hayes to the system of Kukura. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in order to add plug-ins to a menu (Col. 5 Ln. 13 - 15).

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,2,5-8,10-12,14-22,24-28,31-37 and 39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2126

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2126

cea


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100